

31, through U.S. mediation, both sides agreed to withdraw.

I am certainly thankful and I think the world is thankful that this incident did not lead to an armed confrontation. But I am disappointed that at no time during the United States mediation did the President, Secretary of State Christopher, Defense Secretary Perry or then Assistant Secretary of State Holbrook, who has generally done a wonderful job on this issue, at no time did they recognize the sovereignty of Greece over the islet.

Is it my sincere hope this latest incident will not deter the administrations efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem, but rather strengthen the administration's commitment to finding a solution this year of 1996.

As you may know, and I do not suppose many people do, my parents were born on the island of Kalymnos, which I guess the rocks Simi are a part of that particular island chain, and only just a few miles away from the island of Kalymnos. The island has always been considered Greek territory. At no previous time has Turkey questioned Imia's territorial ownership. Indeed, Greek Foreign Minister Theodore Pangalos stated, "This is the first time that Turkey has actually laid claim to Greek territory."

The European parliament overwhelmingly approved a resolution which states, "The Islet of Imia belongs to the Dodecanese group of islands, on the basis of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923, the protocol between Italy and Turkey of 1932, the Paris Treaty of 1947, and whereas even on Turkish maps from the 1960's the islets are shown as Greek territory."

Moreover, the Governments of Italy and France have publicly stated their support of Greek sovereignty over Imia, as provided by international law.

So Madam Speaker, given Turkey's breaches of international law, its continued illegal, and I underline that, illegal occupation of Northern Cyprus, its restrictions on religious freedom from the Eastern Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate, which represents over 250 million Orthodox Christians worldwide, its refusal to recognize the human rights of its 15 million Kurdish citizens, and its illegal blockade of Armenia, I have serious concerns about this most recent example of Turkish provocation.

Although Turkey is an ally, Madam Speaker, its actions must not go unquestioned. In fact, European Commission President Jacques Santer stated in reference to Turkey, "We cannot tolerate a state with which we have just entered into a customs union developing territorial demands on a European union member state."

Turkey must respect and abide by international law. As President Eisenhower once stated, "There can be no peace without law. And there can be no law if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us, and another for our friends."

Madam Speaker, I would say in closing, enough is enough.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill (H.R. 2202) to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes to include a cost estimate as required under clause 2(l)(3) of rule XI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LEWIS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HANSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BROWDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE NEW CONTINUING RESOLUTION IS BAD FOR AMERICAN INDIANS, RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, AND SELF-GOVERNANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I want to make sure that the American public is aware of two very dangerous provisions in H.R. 3019, a continuing resolution which would fund, among other things, Interior spending for the remainder of the fiscal year. Though these two majority sponsored provisions primarily affect American Indians, I believe they have far reaching implications for the rest of the country as well. Why should we care? Because as the great jurist Felix Cohen observed,

The Indian plays much the same role in our American society, that the Jews played in Germany. Like the miner's canary, the Indian marks the shift from fresh air to poison gas in our political atmosphere; and our treatment of Indians, even more than our treatment of other minorities, reflects the rise and fall in our democratic faith.

This country was founded on two great principles—the inalienable right of a people to govern themselves and the solemn right of a people to freely practice their religion. Yet there are two provisions in this spending bill that are an affront to those principles and the rights of our people. I am afraid to think what our Founding Fathers would think of these measures. Had this bill been brought up under an open rule, I would have offered an amendment to strike both of them.

The first provision that deeply concerns me is the Mt. Graham rider contained in section 335 of the general provisions of the Interior portion of the bill which would waive applicable law, reverse three court decisions and permit immediate construction of an observatory on Mt. Graham in Arizona. This is a measure of the worse sort that should be stricken as soon as possible.

First, this rider approves the destruction and mechanized desecration of the single-most sacred site of the San Carlos Apache Tribe. Can you imagine waiving the law to approve the clearing of part of the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem or the Vatican in Rome? Well that is what this provision does, not to mention the fact the telescope's owners plan to charge rent to other users even though it lies on public land. This rider ignores the rights of those who prayed and worshiped on the mountain for centuries and is an assault on religion.

Second, this rider is wrong because it waives the very laws and procedures

designed to ensure that we respect cultural and religious traditions. It circumvents the American Indian Religious Freedom Act and the National Historic Preservation Act which charge the Federal agencies to protect against harm to such sites. The rider does this over the repeated opposition expressed in tribal council resolutions and now in the resolutions of the National Congress of American Indians.

Third, this rider has never been properly considered by Congress. It surfaced mysteriously in the third Interior conference committee without having been included in either of the House or Senate appropriations bills. But to add insult to injury, its sponsors took out a provision of far greater importance in order to get it in—a report on American Indian HIV/AIDS prevention needs. The only hearing ever held on this matter was a joint hearing of two House authorizing committees in 1990 at which the General Accounting Office reported that the irregularities involved in granting the original permit were so great that it would not have withstood judicial scrutiny except for the waiver provided in the last days of the 100th Congress. The official who signed the original permit admitted at that hearing that he had exceeded his legal authority in granting it.

Finally, this rider is bad for the environment because it waives the requirements of the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. All these laws ask is that the agencies examine alternatives to see whether less harmful means are available to achieve the same end. Even if the ESA might preclude the project as proposed, exemptions are available for regionally significant projects. It seems that given the fact that the observatory sits on a world class ecological site left behind by the glaciers that is the home of numerous species of animals and plants, some of medicinal value, and several that are virtually unknown anywhere else, we should at least weigh the alternatives and ask the developers to begin the permit application process. This rider sets a dangerous precedent for further site-specific waivers when the laws of this country get in the way of development.

Since the President vetoed the last Interior appropriations measure in December, Mt. Graham has become a cause celebre. Grammy award-winning rock musicians Pearl Jam have featured it in a new Website for citizenship and the Indian band Red Thunder has also spoken out against the project in their tours and radio appearances. I am proud that this Nation's youth is involved in today's issues, so I would ask that this Congress set a better example for them. We should return to a higher standard of substantive discussion, procedural honesty, and simple justice by striking the Mt. Graham rider.

The second provision which gravely concerns me is the so-called "Lummi" provision contained in section 115 of

the general provisions of Interior portion of bill. Under the guise of "property rights", the measure that would penalize any self-governance tribe in the State of Washington, but particularly the Lummi Nation, for exercising its sovereign on-reservation rights. This provision is dangerous because it sets a precedent for fiscally punitive actions against any tribe in any State, self-governance or not, that tries to exercise its legitimate governmental powers. This act of intimidation flies in the face of the longstanding congressional policy of self-determination and the fiduciary relationship between the United States and the 557 American Indian and Alaska Native tribes in this nation.

This unwarranted and unprecedented intrusion into tribal matters goes against the grain of every anti-Washington, antibureaucracy sentiment embodied in the Contract With America. This provision is unnecessary because it is an extraordinary attempt to unduly influence ongoing and fruitful negotiations between the tribe and local on-reservation property owners. This is a local issue that can and should be resolved through negotiations without the heavy hand of big brother. The Lummi provision is unprecedented in its attack on Indian sovereignty and the ability of tribes to manage their own natural resources.

My history tells me that the tribe acquired its senior water rights more than 140 years ago in the Treaty of Point Elliot in which the tribe reserved enough water to sustain the reservation as a homeland and to support the fisheries resource of the Nooksack Basin. But by penalizing the tribe's funding—up to 50 percent of its self-governance funding which are used to fund education, social services, natural resources, and law and order—for exercising the tribe's senior water rights, the sponsors are doing nothing short of rewriting federal western water law to suit their own purposes.

I would also point out that I am not alone in my assessment because the President in his December 18, 1995 veto message specifically identified the same provision as a reason for his veto. The President rightly noted that in penalizing "these tribes financially for using legal remedies in disputes with non-tribal owners of land on their reservations" this provision does not serve the interests of our nation and its citizens.

Madam Speaker, this action has an unblemished record when it comes to breaking Indian treaties—we have broken every one—so perhaps it should come as no surprise that we are trying to break another. But I for one, and my Democratic colleagues agree, that it is time for us to stop. If we can override federal treaties and laws simply because we do not happen to agree with the claims of one party in a dispute, what does that mean for the rest of us, not to mention any of the other 556 tribes in this country? I have always

been proud of the fact that we are a nation of laws, and of our rich history of justice. But this provision, Mr. Speaker, this provision is not justice.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I'd just like to say that if we as Americans take our rights seriously, if we cherish those principals which made our country great such as the freedom to practice our religion and the freedom of self-determination, then we need to really think about our treatment of Native Americans, and ask ourselves if we can do better. We can start by eliminating the Mt. Graham and Lummi provisions. I urge the White House and the Senate to reject these measures.

THE ALAN KEYES INCIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, last week the whole world was horrified by the spectacle of Ambassador Alan Keyes being handcuffed or otherwise restrained and forcibly prevented from entering into a television area for a debate among candidates.

I feel personally outraged by that entire incident. I feel the insult that Ambassador Keyes must have felt. I feel the dismay that must have flowed through his veins at that time. Then not only was he prevented from entering into the premises, but then carried off like he himself was a criminal and taken to a remote part of the territory there and dumped off like an unwanted citizen. Double outrage, double affront, as it were, more of an insult.

Now, I think that everyone in America has shared that feeling of insult along with Ambassador Keyes, and I suppose many have expressed their regrets. I did and sent a personal note to him expressing my regrets and expressing that I felt with him the range of insults that he must have felt.

But I must tell my colleagues that I have even more reason to associate myself with that insult, because I experienced almost exactly the same thing in the year 1966 in my first venture into politics when I myself was blocked by constables, as it was at that time, from entering into a public political meeting place where I should not have been excluded, but I was.

So I, in viewing the Keyes incident, of course had flashes in front of me of what had happened to me many years ago. There is no way to express this indignation which we are attempting to do here this evening, but I must tell my colleagues I am going to write a letter to the FEC, to the FCC, to the television station in question, to the law enforcement community of that area, to find out exactly what happened and why.

Madam Speaker, I am not sure that Federal laws were violated by those people who strong-armed Mr. Keyes, but equal time always enters into these